## REMARKS

## **Introduction:**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-13, 15-20 and 22-48 are pending in the present application. Applicant is canceling herewith Claims 22-25, 28-29 and 37-39. Following entry of the amendments requested herein, Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-13, 15-20 and 26-27, 30-36 and 40-48 will be pending in this application and will be subject to further examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

## **The Office Action:**

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-42 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-32 of copending Application Serial No. 10/338,796. Claims 11, 23-25, 28, 29, 35 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 11, 23-25, 28, 29, 35 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, a failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 23, 24, 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, a failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections.

## The Double Patenting Rejection:

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20 and 22-42 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Claims 1-32 of copending Application Serial No. 10/338,796. Since this is a provisional rejection, applicant submits that no response is due at this time.

Supplemental Response to Office Action Serial No. 10/007,178

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

Claims 11, 23-25, 28, 29, 35 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first

paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant submits that

this rejection is rendered moot by the previous amendment of Claim 35 and the previous

cancellation of Claim 11 and the current cancellation of Claims 22-25, 28-29 and 37-39.

Conclusion:

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in

view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. Applicants submit that all claims are in

condition for allowance. Such action is courteously solicited. Applicant further requests that

the Examiner call the undersigned attorney if allowance of the claims can be facilitated by

examiner's amendment, telephone interview or otherwise.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert Borichards

Reg. No. 29,105

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800

Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Tel: (404) 815-6500

Fax: (404) 815-6555

Our Docket: 20150-0530 (45882-265681)